

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated July 28, 2005, Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-12, 14 and 16 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 6, 8, 13, and 15 have been withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claims 1, 3-5, 9-12, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Parulski* (5,633,678).

Applicant has canceled Claims 5-11. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that a sequential character is advanced for the image within the memory file and that the assigning step assigns the image with the sequential indicator to the memory file and storing the image with the sequential indicator in the file.

That is, Claims 1 and 12 both recite a sequential indicator for the digital image within the memory file. That is, the device of the present invention not only creates a category or a file identification but sequentially numbers the images within the file. In the *Parulski* reference, and in particular Claim 10, although categories are set forth for the individual images, no sequential numbering "within the memory file" is set forth. In this manner, the present invention allows the images for a particular file to be categorized. The *Parulski* reference merely associates the images from the camera to a file without sequentially numbering them within the file. This may be a source of confusion especially in an inventory tracking situation. Missing numbers within the files are not accounted for. Therefore, the *Parulski* reference does not advance a sequential indicator for the image within the memory file and assigns the image with the sequential indicator to the memory file.

Independent Claim 12 as mentioned above, has a similar limitation that includes "a switch which advances a sequential indicator for said digital image within said memory file." Claim 12 is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Likewise, Claims 2-4 and 13-16 depend from their independent claims and are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

With respect to the previous Office Actions, Claims 1 and 12 are believed to be generic and therefore Claims 2, 13 and 15 are believed to also be allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all rejections are now overcome and the application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which

would place the application in better condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in this filing to deposit account 50-0476.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, PC



Kevin G. Mierzwa, Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: 11/28/05